

REMARKS

This communication is a full and timely response to the aforementioned Office Action dated April 24, 2009 (hereinafter "the Office Action" unless otherwise stated). By this communication, claims 1, 2, 5-8, 10-12, 14-17, 20-22, and 25 are amended. Claims 3, 18, and 23 are cancelled. Claims 26-28 are added. Claims 1-2, 4-17, 19-22, and 24-28 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 16, and 21 are independent.

Reconsideration of the application and withdrawal of the rejections of the claims are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-12 and 14-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hanna et al. (WO 01/72012, hereinafter "Hanna") in view of Hill et al (US Patent 5,191,610). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 recites a method for remotely controlling and/or regulating at least one system. The method includes generating a validation code having a limited period of validity, where the validation code is variably generated to be valid only once for a communication to be dispatched. The method further includes adding validity information to the validation code, which validity information defines the limited period of validity of the validation code. The method also includes combining information relating to the system and the validation code in accordance with a first combination rule. As recited in claim 1, the method further includes dispatching the communication by a communication device assigned to the system, where the communication comprises the information relating to the system, the validation code, and the validation information.

Hanna and Hill, whether alone or in the combination asserted by the Examiner, do not disclose or suggest at the least above features recited in claim 1.

In the Office Action dated April 2, 2009, there is no discussion of validity information defining the limited period of validity of the validation code in the rejection of claim 1. However, in the rejection of claim 5, it is asserted that the rejection of claim 1 includes the validity period. In the Office Action dated November 10, 2008, the Examiner admits that Hanna does not teach a period of validity information which is appended to the communication. Hill does not cure this deficiency. Furthermore, Hill does not disclose or suggest adding validity information to the validation code, where the validity information defines the limited period of validity of the validation code, as recited in claim 1.

Hill discloses a remote operating system having secure communication of encoded messages and automatic re-synchronization. The system of Hill includes a transmitter 100 (Fig. 3) and a receiver 150 (Fig. 4). The transmitter 100 includes a pseudorandom binary number generator 105 (PRBN). The receiver 150 also includes a PRBN 170.

As discussed in col. 7 of Hill, the PRBN generators 105, 170 in the transmitter 100 and receiver 150 are identical, and the next reference identification number is the expected value of the identification number in the received message. If there is a match between the received identification number and the next reference identification number, the command code portion of the received message is decoded by the microprocessor.

The Examiner asserts that the identification number of Hill allegedly corresponds to the validation code and validity information, as recited in claim 1. This

assertion is unsupportable. Hill requires synchronization of the PRBN generators 105, 170 so that the received identification number can be matched with the reference identification number. Accordingly, Hill determines the validity of the received message based on the sent identification number by a matching at the receiver 105. Because a determination of validity is performed at the receiver 105, the identification number sent to the receiver cannot constitute validity information defining the limited period of validity of the validation code, as recited of claim 1. Accordingly, Hill does not disclose or suggest adding validity information to the validation code, wherein the validity information defines the limited period of validity of the validation code and further does not disclose or suggest dispatching a communication including the validation information, as recited in claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Hanna and Hill, whether alone or in the combination alleged by the Examiner do not disclose or suggest all of the features of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable. Claims 16 and 21 are allowable for at least similar reasons to allowable claim 1. In addition, claims 2, 4-15, 17, 19, 20, 22, and 24-28 are allowable by virtue of their dependency from allowable claims 1, 16, and 21 and on their own merits.

Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Hanna, Hill, and further in view of Silen et al. (US PG Pub. 2002/0045442, hereinafter "Silen"). Silen does not remedy the deficiencies of Hanna and Hill with respect to all of the features of its parent claim 1. For at least this reason, claim 13 is allowable.

All rejections raised in the Office Action have been addressed. It is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance and a Notice thereof is respectfully solicited.

If, after reviewing this Amendment, the Examiner believes there are any issues remaining which must be resolved before the application can be passed to issue, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone in order to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: July 1, 2009

By:

 #63985

Patrick C. Keane
Registration No. 32858

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620